

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginsa 22313-1450 www.msplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/910,104	07/20/2001	Tetsushi Kokubo	450100-03353	1695	
20999 FROMMER L	7590 09/09/2009 AWRENCE & HAUG	EXAM	EXAMINER		
745 FIFTH AV	VENUE- 10TH FL.		HU, F	HU, KANG	
NEW YORK,	NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3715		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/09/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/910,104	KOKUBO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KANG HU	3715		

		KANG HU	3715					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REF	PLY FILED 04 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The app app for	☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To a void abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.314. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: Provided Head Provided Head							
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailling. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or NONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.				
have been under 37 (set forth in may reduce	s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later are any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
filin	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp g the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte ice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. X Th (a) (b)	e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belc They are not deemed to place the application in bel	nsideration and/or search (see NO] w);	ΓE below);					
	appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
5. Ap	e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1: uplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all n-allowable claim(s).	:		,				
hov The Cla Cla Cla	r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) when new or amended claims would be rejected is prostatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: iim(s) allowed: iim(s) objected to: iim(s) rejected: 2-7 and 32-37. iim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
8. The	VIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE a affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bucause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and to tealier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
ent	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
REQUES	ne affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER the request for reconsideration has been considered bu		•					
12. 🔲 N	se Continuation Sheet. to the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ther:							
		/Kathleen Mosser/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3715					

а

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Re applicant's response to the rejection, the applicant asserts that Kondo fails to disclose newly amended limitation of "a receiving unit for receiving a request from a user." The examiner respectfully disagrees, Kondo teaches an image processing unit to generate motion control signal, the processing apparatus at least receives a request from the user to process the image. Therefore meets the limitation of a receiving unit for receiving a request from a user.

Re applicant's response that the combination of Chalom in view of Ohga falls to teach a motion presenting unit for outputting an image and motion as a function of the received image data. I D data, and motion data, wherein, when the image data is output, rotational component and zoom component motion data generated from the motion vectors detected from the image data being output are synchronized and output. The examiner respectfully disagree, in office action dated 77/109, the examiner stated that Chalom does to teach of a motion presenting unit. Chalom teaches an image processing apparatus for processing the rotational and zoom component motion detected from the image data. Ohga teaches of a motion presenting unit for outputting the image and motion as a function of the received image data and motion data (Ohga col 3, lines 55-65). The applicant has only relied upon Chalom, and not the combination of Chalom and Ohga. Therefore the argument is not persuasive in our present in the processing the rotational and zoom of the combination of Chalom and Ohga. Therefore the argument is not persuasive the sort present of the processing the rotational and zoom of the combination of Chalom and Ohga. Therefore